1609/1019.

A

DIALOGUE,

BETWEEN A

GENTLEMAN AND A MECHANIC.

A FRIEND of mine, a man of inveſtigating mind and calm temper, had often expreſſed to me a wiſh, to talk over with ſome perſon in the inferior departments of ſociety, the queſtions which ſo widely, and with ſuch pernicious effects, agitate that order. Calling on him of late, one morning, I found him in the full gratification of his wiſh; he was engaged in cloſe converſation with a young man of decent appearance, who caſually came to him on buſineſs. My friend is not ill qualified for the taſk he undertook. The inclination of his mind is to the people. Exempt from thoſe ariſtocratic prejudices which are arrogant in the great, and deſpicable in the middle ranks, a ſtrong conviction of expediency attaches him to the form of government we live under. He loves and he reſpects the Crown, which he conſiders the ſymbol of order, and cement of ſociety; and he adopts the conſtitution,

becauſe he feels it to be the beſt practical ſyſtem of human happineſs. Much is provided for the comforts of life, where every unoffending citizen is unmoleſted in his property and perſon, where the rules of juſtice are fixed, and the diſtribution of it impartial. A man of ſenſe will weigh theſe advantages; he will conſider that tumult is inevitable miſchief, and that the benefits which even the moſt ſanguine expect from innovation, are diſtant and precarious. It is one thing to propoſe an augmentation of the popular influence under our monarchy, and another to render every authority in the ſtate ſubſervient to the democratic repreſentation. So wide is the difference between Reform and Revolution, that the ſanguine advocate of the former meaſure will, when the latter opens to his view, renounce his projects of correction, and cling to the form of government he knows, even though he may be ſenſible of imperfections in it. I do not deny, that the political inſtitutions of any ſtate may be reviſed, and that thoſe of our own country are ſuſceptible of amendment; but ſtable and ſalutary improvement can only be the reſult of time and circumſtances. My friend was aware that my opinions coincide nearly with his own. That very unneceſſary intemperance, which has drawn upon this land ſo many of the evils of civil war, and which now threatens to render it the actual theatre of hoſtility, appears to us both to have more in it of God's vengeance, than

of

of patriotiſm. Proceed, ſaid he, to ſtate your ſentiments without heſitation; this gentleman will not feel leſs ſatisfaction than I do, in expoſing the impoſitions which have drawn a worthy man from the dictates of reaſon and of duty. He is not ignorant that your ſituation expoſes you to temptations, againſt which few precautions are taken to protect you. How little is done to place public opinion, on the ſide of authority, of which it ought to be the baſis!

I AM ſure, continued he, I have neither feelings nor prepoſſeſſions, but for the people. It is for their own ſecurity, and their own benefit, I deſire a limitation of their powers. Reflection points my regard to the moſt uſeful claſs of my fellow citizens; benevolence and ſympathy extend my affection to that diviſion which is the moſt numerous. Never let me hear of diſtinct intereſts between the induſtrious and the opulent; but, if I muſt witneſs that calamity, never let me be ranged unleſs where reaſon and juſtice place me.

MECH. Sir, your declaration ſurpriſes me. I have been uſed to think the intereſts of the different claſſes inveterately oppoſed; and to regard thoſe whom fortune favours, as the oppreſſors of the inferior ranks, to whom ſhe is leſs partial. I hear you with amazement profeſs yourſelf at the ſame time attached to the government, and the friend of the people.

GENT. That is to ſay, you have been taught, that the conveniences of the affluent few are procured at the expence of the labouring many, and that the government, which reciprocally ſupports and is ſupported by this ſyſtem, is radically defective.

MECH. Exactly ſo.

GENT. That opinion I propoſe to controvert, and to prove to your ſatisfaction that every order in ſociety is inſtituted for the common good of every other order; that no one particular rank can exiſt without tending to produce that general effect. You will then be ſenſible, that the feelings, you imagine to be contradictory, are extremely conſiſtent.

You earn at your trade a guinea per week; of courſe you can live more at your eaſe, and make a better appearance, than he who gains only ſeven ſhillings. Do you therefore injure that man? or are you his oppreſſor?

MECH. Aſſuredly, I am not; I do not apprehend that I in any wiſe interfere with him.

GENT. Is it an oppreſſion to you, or an injury, that a maſter tradeſman, who keeps ſeveral journeymen at work, is thereby enabled to maintain his family in a ſtile of greater accommodation, than has fallen to your lot to partake of?

MECH.

MECH. I think not; on the contrary, I find him a neceſſary agent between the working-man and the cuſtomer. I might ſtarve, if I were only to work up my own materials, and had not a ſure and regular demand for my labour.

GENT. I hold to your employer the ſame relation, that he ſtands in to you; ſuch is to me a perſon of larger fortune; ſuch is a nobleman to him. Thus you ſee the reſpective ranks in life, far from oppoſing, do mutually run into and aſſiſt each other.

THE diſtribution of men, into various claſſes of labour and opulence, is not a rule of our government, but a law of our nature. Some are appropriated to mental, ſome to bodily activity. Providence permits the few to ſcatter, very often capriciouſly, in order to chear and ſtimulate the many to diſcharge the duties it allots to them.

HE will readily acknowledge, who conſults his own mind, that health and happineſs are moſt effectually provided for, in a ſtate of regular occupation; but the mere opinion that it is good for him to be employed, is not an incentive ſufficient to overcome in any man the animal inclination to indolence. The ſuperior being has ſo arranged the ſyſtem of the world, that his creatures are led to their good, by the hope of reward; another and a more powerful motive!

ONE

ONE man is affluent and profuſe, twenty derive emolument from ſupplying his fanciful demands; two hundred again are enriched by adminiſtering to the genuine or artificial neceſſities of theſe twenty.

EACH individual is gratified, and each perhaps enjoys tranquillity, more unclouded and uninterrupted than the perſon who is the object and remote ſpring of their activity. The light in which I behold a man of large fortune, who confines himſelf to the drudgery of idle diſſipation, is merely that of a victim to general expediency.

MECH. Permit me to rehearſe your argument, that I may the better comprehend it. I conceive it to be thus: Heaven willed, that man ſhould lead a life of active purſuits, and permitted the introduction of wealth, in order to urge his exertions.

BUT the entire policy, if we may uſe that term, of excluſive property would have been defeated, without another contrivance, the diviſion of it into uneven maſſes. This ſecond propoſition is not alike clear to me. Why might not the purpoſes of property be anſwered, by a more equal and general diviſion?

GENT. In the firſt place, when the law of acquiſition is eſtabliſhed, it is impoſſible to reſtrict the amount. That muſt be left to a variety of perſonal

perſonal qualities in the individual, over none of which can ſociety extend its controul. For inſtance, you cannot ſay to a man, you ſhall be lucky, or frugal, or ingenious to ſuch a degree and no further.

When you advert to the ſyſtem I have laid down, that each perſon is but an engine in the great mechaniſm of circulation, you will be convinced, that the general plan, upon which wealth is diſtributed, is alſo the moſt ſalutary.

A enjoys 10,000*l.* per year. He conſiders a certain degree of parade as appertaining to his ſituation, and freely parts with his money to *B*, *C*, and *D*, who provide for him the means of ſatisfying this imaginary neceſſity. *B*, *C*, and *D*, again diſpoſe of their profits after the manner of their ſuperior, and ſo, the quantity of wealth, thus ſet in motion, paſſes from hand to hand indefinitely; in the tranſition every individual adds his labour and his ſkill, which are preciſely ſo much improvement called into exiſtence; the ſum gained by each is ſo much added to the comforts of life; and the time occupied is ſo much ſnatched from the anxious cares that prey on indolence. All the leſſer claſſes of affluent proprietors, in their ſeveral degrees, contribute in like manner to the general utility.

Now imagine the extent of ſoil which produces an income of 10,000l. per ann. parcelled into one hundred portions, each yielding yearly 100l. This number of proprietors, too poor to indulge in many wants, and too eaſy to feel the urgent ſpur of neceſſity, would live in a condition of languid independence. Calculate upon this ſcale, and you will find that the number of perſons maintained by the ſame maſs of property, is greater twenty fold in the firſt than in the ſecond inſtance; and the proviſion is combined with greater convenience to themſelves, and greater benefit to the community. The ſum I have taken for the example is, in the one caſe, the point from which induſtry ſets out; in the other, the term at which its enterpriſes are concluded.

MECH. Whilſt you argue, my own mind is buſy in forming an illuſtration. Let ſociety be deſigned by a plain, and circulation by the current that waters it. If the courſe of the ſtream be on a very gentle declivity, and in no wiſe diverſified, the vicinity of its bed will only be enriched; but when the channel is over uneven grounds, irregular, and aſſiſted by reſervoirs, where the water occaſionally accumulates and overflows, a ſalutary moiſture is univerſally diffuſed, in which every ſpot participates.

GENT. Your compariſon is appoſite, and here I may conclude this branch of our enquiry, only

only, as the ſubject immediately ſuggeſts it to my recollection; let me note, that from the neceſſity of unequal wealth, I deduce the propriety of certain innocent diſtinctions, by which men of rank endeavour to decorate their opulence. I never have ſeen or read of any people, who, in the intercourſe between the more and leſs rich, did not eſtabliſh, or at leaſt connive at, ſome tokens of reſpect in favour of the former. Wealth ſhould never be allowed to furniſh the means of oppreſſion; but vanity is ſo natural to us all, that I really know not how to be diſpleaſed with the man of eminent rank, who deſires to be addreſſed My Lord, rather than Miſter. Buonaparte is not more humbly placed, becauſe he is not a mareſchal of France. Alcibiades or Cimon, Pompey or Craſſus, felt in their reſpective countries no diminution of importance, for not bearing thoſe emblems of dignity which moderns have invented.

MECH. Certainly a man is not powerful in the ſtate, becauſe he is a lord, but he is a lord becauſe he is powerful. The apology for titles, which merely imply a certain ſtation, and confer no burdenſome privileges, is contained in your former doctrine. If it be admitted that inequality of fortune, even to that degree that the modern world witneſſes, be wiſely contrived, in order to communicate to ſocial man a ſalutary and extenſive impulſe, we ſhould not quarrel with the idle

affluent about the manner of enjoying a rank which is allowed to be eſſential.

GENT. So I think: with becoming manlineſs you diſavow the peeviſh envy, which a proud man in any ſtation diſdains to feel. Whatever privileges are appropriated to certain claſſes, under our government, will more properly be explained when our converſation ſhall lead us to queſtions ſtrictly conſtitutional.

MECH. I am glad you do not enter into that matter at preſent. Your theory of property is not to my mind ſo clear from difficulties as you ſeem to think it.

IF ſtates have exiſted, of which the citizens were wholly, or at leaſt nearly equal, does not this exception to the univerſality deſtroy your argument?

GENT. It might, if the circumſtances of reſemblance were perfectly ſimilar. Point out to me a country in which the freedom of the lower claſſes was conſulted, and an extenſive population ſupplied with neceſſaries on any other condition.

MECH. I hold in view the ancient republics and modern America.

GENT. So I ſuppoſed; France, I preſume, you omit as not ſufficiently proved by experience.

MECH.

MECH. I was aware of that objection.

GENT. There is another matter to be taken with you. Whether thoſe ſtates, whoſe inſtitutions endeavoured to counteract the irregular diſpenſations of fortune, did not ſuffer by the expedient? Political inconveniences enſued of much greater magnitude.

MECH. It is indeed but fair, when we diſcuſs the comparative merits of two ſyſtems, to include the practical conſequences which reſulted from either.

GENT. In America there are local circumſtances, which deſtroy every analogy between the conditions of this, and of that country.

THE population of the American ſtates is not equal to that of Ireland; and their extent of territory is one thouſand miles to our hundred.—Land is ſo eaſily procured, for the overplus of inhabitants to be diſgorged on, that there is little or no occaſion to put any man to his ingenuity for ſubſiſtence.

FOR the ſame reaſon, the want of ſufficient hands to manufacture the land, it cannot for a long time riſe, in favour of the proprietors, to that enormous value, which is requiſite to form the groſs diſparity we treat of. Poſſibly the feelings of ſome perſons may induce them to think that Providence has ordered better for America,

than

than for us; but they can with no more juſtice offer the one country, as a model for the other, than if the warmth of Jamaica was to be urged as a reaſon for not burning coals in Edinburgh.

But, as the cauſes, which render America an exception to the general rule, ſhall gradually be removed, ſhe will follow the courſe of other nations; her ſituation will then call for a change; it is otherwiſe impracticable to employ and ſubſiſt a multitude. I proteſt I ſee the hand of God contriving the welfare of his creatures, as diſtinctly in the modern organization of ſociety, as in the annual reproduction of fruits for our ſubſiſtence.

If we were left to ſcramble each for a ſpot of ground, he who got poſſeſſion would cultivate merely with a view to his own occaſion. What multitudes muſt in that caſe be left to periſh! The arts of refinement, which, whilſt they ornament life, give ſubſiſtence to numbers, would utterly be neglected. Mark, for inſtance the proceſs which converts an handful of raw flax into a piece of cambrick. How much ingenious induſtry ſet in motion! How many hands employed! How much time turned to advantage, which had otherwiſe evaporated in idleneſs.

Mech. You have diſpoſed of the American objection to my ſatisfaction; but the ſame reaſoning does not apply to the governments of antiquity.

Gent.

GENT. This change of property from hand to hand, and the conſequent accumulation in ſome hands, was prevented among the ancients by the practice of ſlavery, which limiting every man's wants to the ſupply of his own family, left no occaſion for barter. The ſame practice of ſlavery rendered it unneceſſary to ſtimulate labour, and ingenuity, by encouragement. A great man had no occaſion to offer a reward for work, which he could compel by his authority.

MECH. What? Slavery exiſting under the Greek and Roman republicks!

GENT. Yes, and ſlavery practiſed with every aggravation of inſolent outrage and contempt for human feelings. There is not a deſpot on earth who aſſumes that capricious dominion over life and limb, which every Roman citizen exerciſed in his family. None of the ancient writers ſeem to conſider a ſlave as a being of the ſame nature. They talk of the ſtripes of ſlaves in a manner, that would ſhock us, if applied to beaſts of burden; and who do you imagine were theſe ſlaves? No other than the entire claſs of artizans, peaſants, and houſe-ſervants.

CICERO in one of his pleadings, I believe for Milo, as an exculpation of his client, defies the accuſer to put the culprit's ſlaves to the torture, with ſuch indifference as I ſhould ſay to a magiſtrate, Sir, you may examine my bureau, if you ſuſpect me.

So little did Livy imagine that cruelty to ſlaves derogated from the character of humanity, that he boaſts of the mildneſs of Roman puniſhments, *nulli populo mitiores placuiſſe pœnas*; whilſt we know, that in the capital of this mild people men diſcharged the ordinary occupations of life, with logs and chains on; and this not by way of puniſhment, but as the uſual garb of their condition. The ears of a paſſenger in the ſtreets of Rome were continually aſſailed, by the cries of wretches, ſuffering under the whip in the adjacent houſes; and it is recorded, as a familiar penalty for offences, not the moſt heinous, to order a ſlave to be thrown bound into a pond to fatten fiſh for his maſter's table.

When the Spartans were at peace with their neighbours, their uſual military exerciſe was an incurſion among their ſlaves, whom they cut off by ſurprize, and without provocation, juſt as we ſend ſoldiers to fire at a target. I ſhall not repeat more of theſe nauſeous barbarities. Where the rights of the many were inſolently trampled under foot, it is no wonder that little proviſion was made for their convenience.

I have adduced theſe inſtances; I could give others without number; my deſign is to draw this concluſion. The ſcheme of the ancient governments was totally different from the plan on which modern ſociety is conſtructed. The end of their inſtitutions was alertneſs in military enterprize.

The

The object of ours is to conduct man by the arts of peace to its accommodations. Where we give encouragement, and propose emulation, they cast fetters. Here to be exempt from restraint is every man's privilege; there it belonged only to a certain order. Produce to me in all boasted antiquity, an establishment, wise, patriotic and benevolent like our Dublin Society.

MECH. Then I am to understand, that among the ancients, neither the legislator, nor the patriot concerned himself for what is called the lower order of the people; and that the energy of Brutus and zeal of Demosthenes, of which I have heard so much, were partial in their object, and circumscribed in their operation.

GENT. And you see this is a condition the reverse of ours. But how wide do we run from our original argument. The citizens of the ancient governments having the power to compel other men, to supply their wants; the practice of daily alienation and minute barter was not necessarily to be resorted to.

A MAN could only enrich himself by successful hostility. Where the fortune of war gave wealth, there it stagnated, like plate or jewels at present, unless the casual prodigality of some possessor dispersed it; gradual income and expenditure were scarcely known.

All citizens lived in idleneſs; politics and war were the ſole purſuits that engroſſed their attention—perſonal authority, over their inferiors gave them, whatever modern manners require to be procured by money. Here lies the difference between the ſyſtems. The ancient completely ſuppreſſed an order of men, whom the modern protects and cheriſhes. Would you change with antiquity?

Mech. No.

Gent. Then you cannot propoſe it for imitation, ſtill leſs for envy. Antiquity, by the uſe of ſlavery, circumſcribed the claſs of free individuals; in America, the ſame order of men is narrowed by local and accidental circumſtances. We adopt a different ſcheme. Certain political advantages are the appendage of property; but law and rights are univerſally equal. So is free agency. Every man is at his own diſpoſal. Ancient liberty acknowledged only a privileged caſt, or, in our language, the rights of gentlemen. Now let us compare the reſpective modes of diſtributing the goods of fortune.

There a man of rank lived at the head of his ſlaves. His conſumption not being mixed with the induſtry of his fellow citizens, he might be prodigal without benefit to any body. He only came into contact with the public, when he choſe to bribe by his bounty, or to dazzle by his magnificence.

In theſe days an opulent individual cannot indulge his fancy without furniſhing to many perſons the means of an independance, equally proud, though not ſo elevated, as his own. I might purſue this ſubject to a very great extent; but it is obvious that ſociety is no loſer by the change of circumſtances. If we do not recognize the proud equality of Athenian citizens, neither do we permit humanity to be degraded under the yoke of Spartan, Roman or Athenian ſervitude.

I hope our converſation has tended to eſtabliſh the principle, from which I ſet out: That the inequality of poſſeſſions, which ſhocks a ſuperficial, or uninformed obſerver, is found, upon an accurate view, to be replete with ſalutary conſequences: The diſtribution is impoſed by neceſſity in a well peopled country; it prevails moſt where the ſcale of population is largeſt, and can only be counteracted by diminiſhing its cauſe, the numbers, and general freedom of the inhabitants.

Suppose a dove-houſe ſtocked with twenty couple, and provided with a fixed quantity of food: they multiply perhaps to one hundred. Either they muſt deviſe ſome expedient to augment the ſupply; or they muſt curtail their phyſical neceſſity; or, every diviſion muſt be a ſcramble, in which the victory is to violence; a ſuperior power interpoſes to prevent them from diminiſhing their number through want, or worrying each other by contentions. Aware that a general and

indeterminate obligation of mutual aſſiſtance will be neglected, he exempts a few in order to impoſe the burthen more directly on the many. Theſe few he ſuffers to appropriate the general maſs of proviſion, creating in them a diſpoſition to parcel it out among their fellows proportionably to the diligence uſed by each, in improving the ſtock of the community. Should unreflecting arrogance complain of error in the arrangement, and endeavour to diſturb it?

MECH. May not poverty be allowed to repine at the weight which ſociety lays upon its ſhoulders?

GENT. Society only carries the will of Providence into execution. Upon the neceſſities of civil life I have accounted for the lottery of earthly diſtribution. It is equally ſanctioned by the law of God, diſtinctly revealed in the Old and New Teſtaments.

THAT the advantage ſhould be unequal is implied in the organization of ſociety; but who is to receive the favour? Why and wherefore is it conferred? Upon theſe queſtions that unerring authority decides, whoſe means never vary from their end; who diſpoſing all things for his own wiſe purpoſes, ordains the good, and permits the miſadventure which befal his creatures.

I CANNOT admit that men are the leſs within the pale of contentment, becauſe they are at a diſtance from

from ſplendid life. The difference between ſimple ruſticity, and the refinement of a court, conſiſts in the indulgence of artificial wants—where theſe are unknown, there is no chaſm in enjoyment, and the cottage is on a level with the palace. Yet, as men are prone to diſcontent, I can conceive a tranſient regret to ariſe at the ſuppoſed ſuperiority of a neighbour; but I cannot conceive, that for an inſtant, a wiſe mind or firm temper would dwell on it. What! eternally to whimper over a decree which I know to be unalterable! Or vainly apprehend, that a Being of infinite ſagacity has erred in the diſpoſal of me; and endeavour to rectify his allotment, by ſubverting the happineſs of thouſands. No! common ſenſe more accurately enjoins to improve our condition by the means which every man poſſeſſes, fidelity and diligence.

MECH. Conſider the rate for which many men in this iſland are condemned to labour.

GENT. AND conſider the redreſs you offer them. The degree of induſtry in a country always determines the price of labour; this, like every other article, riſes and falls in value according as the number is greater or leſs, who have occaſion to uſe it.

THE civil wars about religion, which deſolated Ireland for the laſt century, put all induſtrious arts out of the country, or rather out of thoſe parts,

parts, in which the rate of labour has been at an undervalue.

We were juſt retrieving theſe misfortunes; induſtry revived, the price of labour roſe, unleſs in remote diſtricts, and even thither the improvement promiſed to extend; it ſenſibly was extending, but the progreſs ſeems not to have been ſufficiently rapid for your anxiety. Gracious Heaven! What do you propoſe by returning to that ſtate of diſturbance, in which the evil, you lament, originated? You aim a riſing blow at your country, emerging from her difficulties: Is that patriotiſm? Is it wiſdom?

Mech. The matter was never preſented in that point of view to me.

Gent. Theſe poor people, you will ſay, expect to be better circumſtanced. I grant they do. To hope for a condition more favourable, by the means they reſort to, is one of their follies. Every ſimpleton imagines that he has only to get rid of his landlord to be a Tully or Lycurgus.

They liſten to any projector who fancies, that by intriguing for the French intereſt, he may arrive, under a French military commander, to be a Director or an Adminiſtrator, or a Repreſentative with high appointments. And theſe perſons truly, becauſe they recommend violent proceedings, are immaculate patriots and unbiaſſed counſellors.

counſellors. Some of them are actually bribed by the foreign power, whoſe cauſe they eſpouſe; thoſe who are not in preſent pay are influenced by the proſpect of holding a rank to which, whilſt peace and proſperity are preſerved, they can entertain no pretenſion.

The working people of this metropolis unite in revolutionary deſigns, with the ſame gambling ſpirit of adventure that they enſure in the lottery.

Mech. I cannot ſay but the temper and inducements have much reſemblance.

Gent. You will admit that to overturn an eſtabliſhed government, which is not negligent of its own defence, is an enterprize very improbable as to ſucceſs, and of difficult execution. In the purſuit of this object you may be overtaken by the law. If you eſcape that fate, there is the loſs of time, the change of wholeſome habits, and the ruin of that induſtry which ſupports your family.

Mech. Men who live from hand to mouth, will reply to you that they cannot be worſe, however they may be better.

Gent. But that reply is not ſupported by the fact. They may be worſe, for they may have no ſupport whatever. When the country is diſturbed, all perſons retire from it who have the means to go elſewhere, and the labouring and induſtrious,

to

to whom they gave employment, immediately ſuffer by their abſence. One who earns a guinea per week, may, by the falling off of cuſtomers in troubleſome times, come not to receive half-a-crown; he who has a houſe may be put to the neceſſity of ſleeping under a hedge; and the proprietor of a cow may loſe that comfort of his family. In the hiſtory of the civil wars which afflicted Ireland during the laſt century, we read, that numbers took refuge in the woods, where they often were met crawling like the beaſts of the field in ſearch of herbs, and where dead bodies were frequently diſcovered, with the mouths diſcoloured by graſs, on which the unfortunate victims had endeavoured to ſubſiſt. Is it not better peaceably to earn a livelihood, than to be inſtrumental in introducing the ravages of war, together with famine and diſeaſe, its invariable attendants? Perſons of moſt moderate means are the firſt and the laſt to ſmart under ſuch calamities.

Suppose the wiſh of every deluded dupe, and ſanguine enthuſiaſt realized, and the government ſubverted, can you expect a fate more mild than France, the parent and prototype of revolutions? Amidſt the triumphs of their generals, and conqueſts of their armies, the ſubjects of that government, which bullies Europe, want the neceſſaries of life. It is the vigour of a maniac, who, although ſtarving, knocks down every man he meets with.

ONLY the minority of any country, and a ſmall minority too, can be maintained without labour, and for them, other and equally important occupations are provided. Now every man who attends a meeting, or who bears a pike, a cudgel, or a bill-hook in the cauſe, has an equal claim to be conſidered. If you were to mark my houſe as your reward, there are not houſes a-piece for all, many will of courſe be competitors for the ſame prize, and it becomes an odds of a thouſand to one whether you are gratified. Weigh on the other hand, the probability of getting a houſe or a farm by good conduct. The chances and the opportunities are greater, and purſuit leſs vexatious.

THERE is another obſtacle to this kind of compenſation, which perhaps I ought to have mentioned earlier. If any individual is ſo ſimple as to expect a ſhare in the plunder of a country, too poor adequately to reward the invaders themſelves, let him ſee the extinction of his hopes in the recent proceedings of the French government; it has borrowed money on the credit of this expedition. Cromwell was equipped for the invaſion of Ireland preciſely in the ſame manner, and, like Cromwell's loan, this is to be repaid by dividing the ſoil among the lenders.

I KNEW a country gentleman, who read and reaſoned himſelf into an opinion, that deer were deſigned by nature to be at large, and that it was criminal to confine them: he threw open his park, and

turned

turned the herd into an adjacent mountain, where every one of them was killed within twenty-four hours by the ruſtics of the vicinity. Apply this little incident, and you will find the emblem and illuſtration of all your theories.

Let revolutions be effected without end, there will yet remain rich and poor, and the many ſubordinate to the ſmaller number. Then how can my fellow-ſubjects be ſeduced to favour the enterprizes of deſperate projectors, which may and do make them worſe, but in no reſpect can render them better; and which in the event of ſucceſs can only procure a change of maſters.

With theſe reflections I conclude for the preſent: when your leiſure ſhall permit you to renew the converſation, you will find me chearfully diſpoſed to prove to you, that the popular fancies of the day, if they portend little good on the ſide of ſocial accommodation, are equally hollow in the promiſe of political improvement.

THE END.

BRITISH MUSEUM
15
69
MARA